

I do not say that the Church forbids absolutely the presence of others. It may *tolerate*, it may, under very exceptional circumstances *approve*, the presence of spectators: what I am now chiefly concerned to maintain is, that they who are not communicants, can be *spectators* only—can take no part whatever in the sacred office—and can derive no other benefit from it than such as may result from a devout contemplation of the act of others, or a devout perusal of the service.

Should we, then, be making no approach to union on the principles of our Church, by fully and frankly admitting that this is the case?

Secondly. Our Office recognizes indifferently *two* terms, as being alike applicable to this holy service: our Church teaches us that we may speak alike of the *administration* and of the *celebration* of the Holy Communion. In the first of the two Exhortations we find that, "when the minister giveth warning for the *celebration* of the Holy Communion," he is instructed to say "I purpose to *administer*," while in the second Exhortation he is instructed to say "I intend to *celebrate*." The Church then teaches us, by her own example, to use these terms indifferently: and could never possibly have designed that they should be perverted into party watchwords, or badges of rival schools; and yet this cannot fail to be the case, except we use her language as she herself does, and do not insist either on "*celebration*" or "*administration*" as the *exclusively* appropriate term.

Again we must remember if we would meet each other on the common ground of the Church, that in her view it is the *Holy Communion*, which is either *celebrated* or *administered*. Are we quite sure that the dislike to the term *celebration* may not have arisen from the suspicion that something *else* is regarded as the object of the celebration; that there is a part of the service, wholly independent of, and distinct from, the Communion, in which, accordingly, persons who do not communicate may fitly and profitably participate? I would ask again, does our office, in its obvious sense, afford *any ground whatever* for the maintenance of such an opinion?

Thirdly—While the Church uses *both* terms, we must not forget that she has placed "*administration*" in the fore-front, using it in the title, which is prefixed to the service; and that she has thus intimated to us that she regards the "*administration*," as the essential feature of the sacred rite; associated indeed most closely with the "*celebration*," apart from which we cannot conceive of the "*administration*" as retaining the character of a religious service.

I am glad here to avail myself of the authority of Dr. Hook, who, in his *Lives of the Archbishops*, makes frequent reference to the subject. In his *Life of Cranmer* (Vol. I. New series, page 426) he says: "The real work of the Reformation was the changing of the Mass into a Communion, as will hereafter be shown, and this involved the dogma of transubstantiation." Again (Vol. II., new series, page 150) he says: "Protestants of all shades of opinion were united on this one

point, that the mass should be turned into a communion. The mass was regarded as a sacrifice of our Lord for the quick and the dead. This the Reformers one and all denied; they maintained that it was a communion, through which the faithful were united to God; and that the sacrifice was the offering of themselves, their souls and bodies, to God's service, in common with the hosts of heaven. The controversy was perplexed, as it still is, by the fact that the Reformers did not deny that in the Eucharist there is a sacrifice; but the question is, what kind of sacrifice? It is one thing to offer Christ as a sacrifice for sin, and another thing for those who have been accepted through Christ as God's servants, to offer themselves as a sacrifice, a body of persons prepared to serve God in body and soul. The Church from the beginning had regarded the Eucharist as a sacrifice in the last sense of the word—a memorial before God of the great work once, and once for all, done upon the cross, and at the same time a dedication, a Eucharistic sacrifice of the Church, as a whole and in all its parts, to the service of God. In process of time the Western Church, instead of offering itself as a sacrifice on the merits of the one full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction, once and once for all, made upon the cross, regarded itself as offering the Lord Jesus Christ Himself."

I would also refer the reader to Dr. Hook's sermon on the Holy Eucharist (The Church and Her Ordinances Vol. I., page 360) from which I make the following extracts: "The chief reference to the sacrifice of the cross belongs, according to the right doctrine, to the sacramental part of the Eucharist. The sacrifice of the cross is exhibited and represented before God and men, under the symbols of the bread and wine; and the bread and wine being duly consecrated, become to the worthy communicants, to all intents and purposes, virtually and interpretatively, the Body and Blood of that precious Lamb of God, who was once, and once for all, offered upon the cross; and by partaking of them we become partakers of the one atoning sacrifice. The grand sacrifice once offered is dispensed and communicated to individual believers in the Eucharist, by and through the consecrated symbols; but it is not repeated. Hence the Eucharist is regarded as a Feast upon that great sacrifice." (pp. 372, 3.)

Having traced the different senses in which the Eucharist is to be regarded as a sacrifice, the author thus sums up his view: "How glorious, how sublime, how overwhelmingly grand is the view thus taken of the distinguishing rite of Christian worship! The one sacrifice of our God, once made upon the cross, gratefully commemorated, and in a figure exhibited before God, and men, and angels, as our only hope of salvation; that one sacrifice applied to faithful hearts, so that they themselves may have grace to offer their spiritual sacrifices, and the whole service a peace offering, a sacrifice of thanksgiving to the King of kings and Lord of lords." (Ibid p. 378.)

I hope on a future occasion, if opportunity

should be given, to strengthen and illustrate, by other quotations, the view of our office, which is here presented by Dean Hook.

GEORGE WHITAKER.

HOOKE ON THE GRACE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

IT will be seen by the last two extracts made from the writings of the celebrated divine, whose name is at the head of this article, that the opinions be held on the doctrines of grace by the Sacraments are not wholly identical with the opinions of all high churchmen; while it is no less evident that he strongly insisted on that doctrine, even so far as to maintain that there is a *real presence* of CHRIST in the Holy Communion. That doctrine therefore is not the doctrine of any one party only in the Church, as some maintain; but has always been believed by all loyal and true churchmen from the very first. And those who are now setting themselves up to oppose, as Sacramentarians and Sacerdotalists, those loyal Churchmen who still teach it, are not Churchmen at all, but out-and-out Puritans—the very men against whom Hooker as a low Churchman wrote, whose unhappy origin he exposed, and against whose errors he has warned all sound Churchmen.

And if followers further from these considerations, that those men calling themselves Churchmen, setting themselves up in opposition to the Bishops, who have all or nearly all Divinity Schools of their own,—and ignoring the Synods of the Dioceses,—Synods which are responsible to the great body of the Church, which these men are not—it follows we say that these self-constituted teachers are either culpably ignorant of what Church doctrine has always been, and are teaching for it the most pernicious errors, to men for whom they hope to procure ordination, or else that they are dishonestly trying by the use of high sounding words, which to many men have but a vague and uncertain meaning, to create a prejudice against the scriptural doctrines of the Church, and to substitute for them the pernicious errors of Puritanism. Which of these unenviable positions any one of them may choose to adopt, must of course be left to his own conscience, and to Him who knows the secrets of all hearts; for far be it from us to judge any man. But it is our duty to warn all honest and loyal Churchmen against the danger which threatens us, if men trained under such auspices ever find their way into the Church as its teachers.

That any of our Canadian Bishops will ever fall into the trap thus set for them, and ordain men over whose training they have no control we cannot believe. They have always proved themselves too clear headed and loyal Churchmen for this. And we are confident they are too deeply impressed with the grave responsibility of being in their respective Dioceses the chief defenders of the faith once for all delivered to the saints, to abandon this their prerogative into the hands of a few purse-proud men, who set their authority at defiance, and repudiate the doctrines the Church has always taught. These men are